

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes new Figures 6 and 7.

Attachment: New Sheet, 1 page

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed December 5, 2008 in the above captioned patent application.

In that Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 9-10 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by EP 1103349 to Amherd.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC §103 for allegedly being obvious based upon the EP '349 patent to Amherd.

Claims 6-8 were rejected for alleged obviousness based upon EP '349 in view of US 2003/0089360 to Eckert.

Claim 11 was rejected for alleged obviousness based upon EP '349 in view of US 7,143,626 to Dole.

Claim 12 was rejected for alleged obviousness based upon EP '349 in view of US Patent 3,851,285 to Rothfuss et al.

Claim 13 was rejected for alleged obviousness based upon EP '349 in view of JP 61118574 A to Kamishiro et al.

Claim 14 was rejected for alleged obviousness based upon EP '349.

Applicant appreciates the careful and thoughtful review by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that in view of the clarifications presented herein, all pending claims and several new claims are in condition for allowance.

A. Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the cordial interview conducted on December 3, 2008 with the Examiner.

It is believed that the amendments and new claims presented herein are in accordance with the helpful comments from the Examiner. The amendments and new claims are discussed in greater detail below.

B. Objection to Drawings Has Been Remedied

The Examiner indicated that the rollers without through-bores must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims.

A new drawing sheet containing new Figures 6 and 7 is hereby presented. Figures 6 and 7 parallel Figures 3 and 4, respectively, but illustrate the rollers 2 devoid of through-bores. No new matter is added by Figures 6 and 7 since support is found in the application as originally filed, and in particular, in the last paragraph on page 3 of the English language version of the application where description of rollers without through-bores is provided.

In view of the presentation of new Figures 6 and 7, appropriate descriptions are also presented for inclusion in the specification. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

C. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, and 9-10 Under §102 Should be Withdrawn

Claims 1, 3-5, and 9-10 were rejected under §102(b) for anticipation by EP 1103349 to Amherd.¹

Of the rejected claims, claim 1 is the only independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited art. Claim 1 as now amended, recites in part, that the bearing block is provided with "an arcuate sliding bearing surface for each roller, which its shape corresponds to the roll surface and thus to the outer diameter of the cylindrical roller." This feature is depicted in Figure 5 of the present application where the arcuate shape of the sliding bearing surfaces 11 and 12 is shown.

The EP '349 document entirely fails to disclose a bearing block having such arcuate sliding bearing surfaces and which correspond to the roll surface and outer diameter of the cylindrical roller.

In view of the amendments to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that neither claim 1 nor any of claims 2-5 and 9-10 dependent therefrom, are anticipated by the EP '349 document. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should now be withdrawn.

D. Rejection of Claim 2 Under §103 Should be Withdrawn

Claim 2 was rejected for alleged obviousness based upon the EP '349 document to Amherd. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and so contains all of the recitations from

¹ The US equivalent is US Patent 6,662,621 to Amherd.

that claim. The EP '349 document entirely fails to describe or even suggest providing bearing surfaces on a bearing block that are arcuate. Since claim 1, particularly as now amended, is believed to be patentable over the EP '349 document to Amherd, so too is claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

E. Rejection of Claims 6-8 Under §103 Should be Withdrawn

Claims 6-8 were rejected for obviousness based upon the EP '349 document in view of US 2003/0089360 to Eckert. Claims 6 and 7 (claim 8 was previously cancelled) ultimately depend from previously discussed independent claim 1, and so contain all of the recitations of that claim. As previously noted, the EP '349 document entirely fails to teach the subject matter of claim 1, particularly as now amended.

The '360 publication to Eckert fails to remedy the deficiencies of the EP '349 document. That is, Eckert completely fails to teach or even suggest a roller holder unit comprising a bearing block which is provided with an arcuate sliding bearing surface, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

F. Rejection of Claim 11 Under §103 Should be Withdrawn

Claim 11 was rejected for obviousness based upon the EP '349 document in view of US Patent 7,143,626 to Dole. As with the previously discussed dependent claims, claim 11 also depends from claim 1, and thus claim 11 contains all of the recitations of that claim.

The '626 patent to Dole fails to remedy the deficiencies of the EP '349 document. Specifically, the '626 patent entirely fails to teach a bearing block having the arcuate sliding bearing surfaces as now recited in amended independent claim 1. The '626 patent is directed to crimping jaws and does not illustrate any rollers or roller holders.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 11 should now be withdrawn.

G. Rejection of Claim 12 Under §103 Should be Withdrawn

Claim 12 was rejected for obviousness based upon the EP '349 document in view of US Patent 3,851,285 to Rothfuss. Claim 12 is dependent from independent claim 1, and thus contains all of the recitations of that claim.

The '285 patent to Rothfuss is directed to control magnets for hydraulic control system valves. The '285 patent has nothing to do with pressing tools and entirely fails to remedy the deficiencies of the EP '349 document.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

H. Rejection of Claim 13 Under §103 Should be Withdrawn

Claim 13 was rejected for obviousness based upon the EP '349 document to Amherd in view of JP 61118574A to Kamishiro et al. Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1 and thus, contains all of the recitations from that claim.

The JP '574 document describes a component used in a rotary compressor. The JP '574 document has nothing to do with pressing tools. The JP '574 document entirely fails to remedy the deficiencies of the EP '349 document to Amherd.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 13 should now be withdrawn.

I. Rejection of Claim 14 Under §103 Should be Withdrawn

Claim 14 was rejected based upon the EP '349 document to Amherd. Claim 14 depends from claim 1, and thus contains all of the recitations from claim 1.

Since claim 1, particularly as now amended, is submitted to be patentable over the EP '349 document, so too is claim 14. Thus, it is requested that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

J. New Claims 15 and 16

New independent claims 15 and 16 are presented herein for the Examiner's consideration.

New claim 15 generally parallels claim 1 as amended, and additionally recites that each sliding bearing surface is "formed in the bearing block as a cylindrical cut-out." New claim 16 parallels claim 1 as amended, and additionally recites that "each arcuate sliding bearing surface face[s] a corresponding roller." Claim 16 further recites that "the shape of each arcuate sliding bearing surface[s] correspond[s] to the roll surface and thus to the outer diameter of the roller." No new matter is added by these

amendments since support is found throughout the present application as originally filed.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the art of record.

K. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 and 9-16 are all in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. RTC-17657.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By /Mark E. Bandy/
Mark E. Bandy, Reg. No. 35788

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700